

A MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM FOR CILSS

Dr. Elizabeth Adelski
Consultant, The Mitchell Group

May 18, 2000
INSAH
Bamako, Mali

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Once again I thank my colleagues at INSAH for finding the time in their busy schedules to work with me on M&E and indicators. It was a pleasure to meet and work with the CERPOD staff, Baba Traore, Keffing Dabo, Moussa Dolo, and Sadio Traore. I thank Baba Traore for his time and patience explaining the intricacies of CILSS's organization. I thank all my friends in the AGROSOC program for participating in the second round of defining indicators, and look forward to working with them again on a different aspect of the M&E system.

Minata Tangara, Ashta Abderaman, Alhousseiny Toure, and Bouraima Konate of The Mitchell Group again deserve my thanks for their kind hospitality, assistance, and friendship during my visit.

I thank my fellow consultants, Chako Cherif and Blamsia Braoussala, for their patience and good humor during our long discussions of the M&E system.

Most of all I thank Wilbur Thomas and Jorge Oliveira for their sound suggestions on how to get the work done, their deft management, and their unfailing patience with both the substance and the logistics of producing this report. Je vous remerci tous.

ACRONYMS

AGRHYMET	Agro-hydro-meteorology Center
AGROSOC	Agro-socio-economic Research Program, INSAH
CD	Conseil de Direction, Management Council
CERPOD	Center for Research on Population and Development,
CILSS	Permanent Interstates Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel
CONACILSS	National CILSS Committee
CP	Conseil de Planification, Planning Counselor
CRPS	Regional Committee for Programming and Monitoring
CTG	Comite Technique de Gestion, Technical Management Committee
DG	Director General
EU	European Union
INSAH	Institute of the Sahel
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MP	Major Program
NAP	National Action Plan (for NRM)
NARS	National Agricultural Research Systems
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NRM	Natural Resource Management
OVI	Objectively verifiable indicator
SE	Executive Secretary of CILSS
SNRA	National Agricultural Research Service
SRAP	Subregional Action Plan
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development

TABLE of CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
I. Purpose of the Consultancy	1
II. Constraints on and Recommendations for Setting Up the M&E System	1
III. A Monitoring and Evaluation System for CILSS	2
A. The Institutional Context	2
B. Existing Components of the M&E System	3
C. The Proposed M&E System	3
1. The Monitoring System	3
2. The Evaluation System	5
IV. Tables	7
V. Bibliography	16
VI. People Contacted	17
VII. Terms of Reference	18

I. Purpose of the Consultancy

The overall purpose of this consultancy was to design a M&E system in collaboration with the CILSS consultant, Chako Cherif, and CILSS's Planning Counselor, Blamsia Braoussala. This process included discussing Cherif's work, revising it, and making two presentations of the proposed design to the INSAH staff. The consultant's other task was to work with INSAH's two Major Programs to draft evaluation indicators for their Operational Objectives and Results. This report contains the draft indicators and proposes a M&E system for CILSS. The latter should serve as a step in the technical process of designing the M&E system.

II. Constraints on and Recommendations for Setting Up the M&E System

This report is intentionally brief. Considerable effort has been invested in designing a M&E system for CILSS and the constraints on doing so are generally known, if not in written form. The purpose of this section is to highlight the major constraints that still exist on making concrete progress toward setting up the system, and to make recommendations to address them.

1. Constraint: CILSS's partners (States and donors) have not reached consensus on and formally articulated their information needs. Both are necessary as the basis for designing the M&E system and for defining the levels and types of indicators required to meet those information needs. The Major Programs whose results are funded by different donors with different M&E requirements are in an impossible position. The donors' articulation of their information needs remain informal and general. The consultant asked for them two years ago, when working with AGRHYMET's Major Programs to define indicators, in order to have a clear orientation for M&E. The information needs are still not clearly and formally defined. Neither the M&E consultants nor the Major Program staff are sure what the partners want in terms of M&E. It is putting the cart before the horse and a poor use of resources to work on designing a M&E system and have the Major Programs draft indicators until these information needs are established.

Recommendation: The CILSS's partners produce a formal statement of their information needs and the levels and types of indicators that they require to meet them. Then the partners must reach consensus with the SE and the Major Programs on the information requirements and how to meet them.

2. Constraint: There are divergent monitoring-information needs among the CP, the Major Programs, and the CTGs. The CP reports that in 1999 he standardized the forms for the Major Programs to use for both their bi-annual, activity-level monitoring reports for the SE, and to present this information at their CTGs. The Major Programs report that their different CTGs require different categories of monitoring information, so they are obliged to produce annual monitoring information in two formats. The CONACILSS used to require yet another set of information. Meeting these divergent monitoring-information requirements has increased the workload at all staff levels.

Recommendation: The divergent monitoring-information requirements need to be resolved so that one set of annual information, in one standardized format, meets all the actors' requirements. This will require the partners, the SE, the Major Programs, and the CONACILSS to reach consensus on the types of annual monitoring information required and on a standardized

reporting format. The consensus is essential in order to design a M&E system.

3. Constraint: CILSS's M&E Cell lacks expertise in M&E methodology, use of the computer, and database management. This lack of expertise retards progress toward designing and implementing a M&E system. These deficiencies will compromise quality control and the operation of the M&E system.

Recommendation: Provide funding to hire an M&E expert and a computer expert for the M&E Cell. Both should have significant, demonstrated experience in managing large-scale M&E systems with international development projects.

4. Recommendation: CILSS is a complex institution with numerous actors. Setting up a computerized M&E database for it will be a complex task. The consultant strongly recommends that the computer expert set up the monitoring database for one Center and then do a "test run" of collecting, inputting, analyzing, and producing the data for a quarterly monitoring report. The purpose of the test run is to give the computer expert and CILSS the opportunity to resolve the problems that inevitably will arise with a complex database. The test run will give CILSS the advantage of addressing the problems on a small scale, which will facilitate implementing the rest of the database. The same test-run procedure should be used with the evaluation database.

5. Recommendation: AGRHYMET is planning to set up a biophysical database. It should be designed to be compatible with CILSS's M&E database, so that biophysical data are readily available to help assess CILSS progress and impact in NRM.

6. Observation: The CP's and staff's general expectation that an M&E system will single-handedly improve synergy, management, resource allocation, and funding is overly optimistic. M&E is only one tool of several that can help make improvements in these areas. It would be useful to increase staff awareness about the purposes and utility of CILSS' M&E system. At this time its major purposes apparently are to: 1) provide information on performance and impact over time so that donors can justify and continue their funding; and 2) produce information on the Operational Units' strengths and weaknesses in executing activities, in order to inform programming.

III. A Monitoring and Evaluation System for CILSS

A. The Institutional Context

A monitoring and evaluation system should be designed to respond specifically to its users' information needs. The users' information needs structure the M&E system so that it focuses on and generates the required information--no more, and no less. The various levels of information-users at CILSS need to come to consensus on and articulate their information needs, so that the consultants have a clear orientation for their work. This is particularly important with CILSS because there are numerous actors--nine States, seven donors, three centers, and many activities--and thus, potentially, a plethora of information needs. The partners' (States and donors) information needs have been communicated to the consultants only in informal and general statements. Their general request is for regular, objective information that shows progress towards CILSS's objectives and results.

The informal communications from the donors (only those at CILSS in Ouagadougou) have requested that the evaluation system:

1. Evaluate the performance and impact of the current programs;
2. Provide annual reports for the CTGs;
3. Measure long-term impacts;
4. Provide useful M&E information for several levels of users: researchers, program managers, donors, and member States;
5. Evaluate impact (i.e. demonstration of change) every three and ten years at the Major Program Results levels, using objectively verifiable indicators.

This report proposes an M&E system based on those statements and CILSS's existing information-collection system. The consultant hopes that it provides the basis for clarifying information needs, at both the monitoring and evaluation levels, and for making progress in designing the system. Note that in this report the phrase CILSS's "partners" or "development partners" means its donors, the States, and civil society (NGOs, associations, platforms).

B. Existing Components of the M&E System

The 1999-2001 *Plan Triennal* contains some relevant information for designing a M&E system. The consultant has used the *Plan* as the definitive reference for CILSS's rather complex intervention strategy, so that there is a standard reference for key points such as the existing OVIs. The different levels of CILSS's intervention strategy and how they correspond to the Major Programs' levels are shown in Table 1. The donors have requested performance and impact evaluation at three of these levels (CILSS's Operational Objective, Intermediate Results, and Principal Activities). The objectively verifiable indicators (OVIs) in the *Plan Triennal* that CILSS already has defined for its Operational Objective and Intermediate Results are listed in Tables 2 and 3. Based on the years (2001 and 2004) in these indicators the consultant assumes that they are designed to assess impact at the end of the current three-year plan (2001), at the end of the next three-year plan (2004), and at the end of the current ten-year plan (2004).

Summary of the OVIs for evaluation defined in the current three-year *Plan*:

1. Three for CILSS's Operational Objective (the Major Programs' Strategic Objective), see Table 2;
2. Eleven for CILSS's six Intermediate Results (the Major Programs' Operational Objectives), see Table 3;
3. None for CILSS's Principal Activities (the Major Programs' Results). There are draft indicators at this level for the Policy Programs and for both Programs at INSAH (Adelski 1999 and this report, respectively). The draft Results-level indicators for the INSAH Programs are in Tables 5 and 6 below.

C. The Proposed Monitoring and Evaluation System

1. The Monitoring System

The monitoring system is summarized in Table 7. Its overall purpose is to track the correlation between the Major Programs' Activity- and Subactivity-level plans and

accomplishments (outputs) in Program. The system includes monitoring in two other categories proposed by the other CILSS consultants: "new activities and programs" and "conventions and agreements." The "information producers" in column two are responsible for producing monthly and quarterly reports; those in column five are responsible for aggregating this information into bi-annual and annual reports. Comments from the INSAH staff indicate that the heads of the Operational Units, Major Programs, and INSAH will want to write short, contextual explanations of the monitoring information, rather than leaving this task entirely to the CP (or whoever in the SE produces the bi-annual and annual reports). The Major Program heads and DGs therefore are listed as information producers in column five.

The monitoring system should be designed in collaboration with a computer expert and set up as a centralized, standardized database. The M&E Cell would manage the database and analyze the monitoring information. This will require hiring an expert to 1) set up the database; 2) train staff to use it; 3) maintain quality control; and 4) manage the database and data analysis. The database should be designed to store, aggregate, and disaggregate different levels of monitoring data over time and space. For example, the variables--Activities and Subactivities--would be coded by year, month, quarter, Center, Major Program, and Result so that different information could be retrieved and analyzed as needed. The quantitative analysis of outputs will be complemented by concise summary reports. The database should improve the organization and durability of CILSS's information, and facilitate access to it. The current system of recording monitoring information on forms and in reports has led to lack of standardization in reporting, information scattered among staff (i.e. different Program staff having different pieces of monitoring data), and the loss of information over time due to lack of adequate archives.

The types of monitoring information to be recorded at the Activity and Subactivity levels must be negotiated and agreed upon in all three Centers and with CILSS's partners to ensure that it meets their information needs. Then the format for recording the information in the database can be standardized. During this consultancy the CP and INSAH Program heads agreed on the categories of monitoring information to collect, based on revising the CP's current form. The major categories of information were: activities planned; activities realized; activities not planned but realized; the differences between plans and accomplishments; observations. This is the first step toward standardizing data collection and must be continued. Unfortunately a copy of the revised form was not left at INSAH.

Monitoring indicators for the M&E system must be defined for each Major Program's activities in each three-year plan and in their annual operational plans. Most of the OVIs in the current *Plan Triennal* are in fact monitoring indicators. Given the workload at CILSS, it is realistic to aim to set up the M&E system, including defining monitoring and evaluation indicators, in early 2001. That year could serve as the system's "test run," to work out its bugs, and CILSS could aim to have the system operational for the 2002-2004 *Plan*. The consultant strongly recommends the test run as the first step in implementing the monitoring system. This can be done by having the computer expert set up the database, enter the monitoring information from only one Center, analyze it, and produce it in the form required for a quarterly monitoring report. This will allow the expert to work out the system's problems at a small scale.

In summary, the database for monitoring will:

- * Standardize information collection and recording;
- * Improve and standardize quality control;
- * Facilitate the standardized reporting of monitoring information;
- * Facilitate the longitudinal analysis of monitoring data;
- * Facilitate the analysis of monitoring data across space (from the different Centers and States);
- * Facilitate the aggregation and disaggregation of information at seven major levels (subactivity, activity, result, Major Program, Center, new activities/programs, and conventions/agreements);
- * Optimize access to monitoring information for different levels of users, from individual to institutional; and
- * Optimize long-term data storage (archives).

Setting up the monitoring database will require:

- * Funding;
- * Reaching consensus on the structure of the monitoring system (including the numbers of indicators, the categories of information required, the levels of information recording and reporting, periodicity, the information producers, reporting formats);
- * Reaching consensus on the monitoring indicators for 2001 and for the 2002-2004 *Plan*;
- * Hiring a computer expert to: design the database, set it up, input the first set of data, and work out the bugs;
- * Training the CILSS staff to input data and use the database;
- * Retaining the computer expert to maintain quality control, manage the database, and conduct data analyses.

2. The Evaluation System

The evaluation system is summarized in Table 8. The system fits in the context of CILSS's long-range, ten-year plan that contains its three-year, rolling plans. The evaluation system proposes to evaluate performance and impact at three levels: CILSS's Operational Objective, Intermediate Results, and Principal Activities. Performance--progress made toward these goals--will be assessed every three years using OVIs. Impact--change over the long-term--will be evaluated every six and ten years, to coincide with the near-midpoint and the end of the ten-year plan.

The current ten-year plan and the next three-year plan will both end in 2004. The *Plan Triennal* has three OVIs to assess the impact of CILSS's work at its Operational Objective level in 2004 (Table 2). Additional indicators at this level and revisions of the *Plan's* indicators are in Table 4. The *Plan* also has eleven indicators to evaluate impact at the level of the Major Programs' six Operational Objectives; six are indicators for 2004, and five are for 2001 (Table 3). CILSS has not yet defined indicators to assess impact and performance at the Program Results level, which the donors have requested. There are draft Results-level impact indicators for AGROSOC and CERPOD in this report (Tables 5 and 6) and for the Policy Programs (Adelski 1999). Performance indicators at the Results level have not been drafted. Input from CILSS's partners is essential for defining and reaching consensus on the number and type of

OVIIs required at all three levels. Also, some of the indicators in the current *Plan* may require revision. The Major Programs should participate in the process of defining and reaching consensus on the evaluation indicators, to ensure that all the key actors' evaluation-information needs are met.

Collecting the information on most of the evaluation indicators is likely to be a time-consuming task. It will require reviewing policies and documents in the nine States, collecting national statistics, and collecting information from CILSS. Analyzing the information in terms of the indicators also will be time-consuming. The CILSS's staff can contribute to the evaluations but given their workload it probably will be necessary for the partners to fund two or three technicians for each evaluation to do most of the work with the M&E Cell. How to allocate staff time and funding to the evaluations must be decided by CILSS and its partners. A small-scale "test run" is imperative as the first step in moving an evaluation system from theory into practice, and the consultant strongly recommends this to CILSS. A test run could be done by taking a subset of the evaluation indicators and going through the entire process of collecting, analyzing, and writing up the information on them. This practical exercise will indicate the level of effort required for a full-scale evaluation.

The evaluation system should have a centralized, standardized database that is set up by a computer expert and managed by the M&E Cell. The database will be structured like that for the monitoring system and will have the same advantages: it will code and store CILSS's evaluation data across time and space, standardize information collection and reporting, improve quality control, facilitate the analysis of long-term impact, and optimize users' access to the information. One computer expert should be able to manage both databases as the evaluations will only be done every three years.

Assessing change at the beneficiary level (rural and urban populations) is costly in terms of time and funding. CILSS can use secondary information such as national statistics (e.g. agricultural production, household income, land use) to track changes in food security and NRM over time and determine if the trends are in the desired direction. CILSS also reports that some beneficiary-level information is available from NRM projects (and from other types of relevant projects?). At some point--probably at the end of each ten-year plan--beneficiary-level information will be necessary to ground-truth the validity of CILSS's indicators, research, and recommendations. Longitudinal information from IRENE at AGRHYMET could contribute to this level of impact-assessment by reporting on changes in the regional natural resource base.

IV. Tables

Table 1. CILSS and Its Centers: Corresponding Levels in the Intervention Strategy (*Plan Triennal 1999-2001*)

CILSS Level	Major Program Level
Strategic Objective Contribute to creating the conditions for sustainable development in the Sahel, using a regional-integration approach based on research on food security and rational natural resources management.	None.
Operational Objective The constraints on sustainable food security and rational NRM in the Sahel are understood.	Strategic Objective This is the Strategic Objective for all the Major Programs.
Intermediate Results 1. Create the conditions for sustainable food security in the Sahel. 2. CILSS supports the formulation and implementation of coherent strategies and policies for sustainable NRM in the Sahel. 3. Provide regular and pertinent information to policy-makers and other actors for more rational decision-making about food security, NRM, and the environment in the Sahel and coastal West Africa. 4. Increase and reinforce the technical capacities of the national- and regional-level actors who work in the areas of food security and NRM through professional training adapted to the Sahelian context. 5. Promote strategic options to alleviate the agro-socio-economic constraints on sustainable development in the Sahel at the national and subregional levels. 6. Formulate and propose options to alleviate the demographic constraints on the Sahel's sustainable development for the CILSS States and the subregional level.	Operational Objectives 1. Food Security Policy Program. 2. Natural Resources Management Policy Program. 3. Information Program, AGRHYMET. 4. Training Program, AGRHYMET. 5. Agro-socio-economic Research Program, AGROSOC, INSAH. 6. Population and Development Research Program, CERPOD, INSAH.
Principal Activities CILSS has 21 Principal Activities, 3-5 per Intermediate Result.	Results There are 21 Results among the six Major Programs, 3-5 per program.

Table 2. CILSS's Operational Objective and Indicators
(*Plan Triennal 1999-2001*)

CILSS's Operational Objective	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification
The constraints on sustainable food security and rational NRM in the Sahel are understood.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In 2004, food needs in all the CILSS countries are entirely covered. 2. Between 2001 and 2004, all the CILSS countries have legislation that guarantees their populations' participation in and responsibility for natural resource management. 3. Beginning in 2004, the principal indicators of the degradation of natural resources are at least stabilized. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. States' foodstuffs balance sheets and national statistics. 2. States' legislative texts. 3. Annual balance sheets of the status of natural resources and the Information Program at AGRHYMET.

Table 3. CILSS's Intermediate Results and Indicators
(*Plan Triennal 1999-2001*)

CILSS's Intermediate Results (Programs' Operational Objectives)	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Source of Information
Food Security Policy Program: Create the conditions for sustainable food security in the Sahel.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In 2004, the average rate of growth of domestic production increases from 2.8% to at least 3.1%. 2. In 2004, the average volume of food aid does not exceed more than 1% of the volume of consumption. 3. Between 1999 and 2001, all the States have permanent food stocks to cover at least 3 months of consumption needs. 4. Between 1999-2001, at least 60% of the tariff and non-tariff constraints reported by CILSS/FERAP are effectively lifted. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. and 2. National and regional statistics, AGRHYMET's Information Program, Food Security Policy Program. 3. National organizations responsible for food security, Food Security Policy Program, CONACILSS. 4. Food Security Policy program, CONACILSS.
NRM Policy Program: CILSS supports the formulation and implementation of coherent strategies and policies for sustainable NRM in the Sahel.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All the CILSS countries have formulated and implemented their National Action Plans during 1999-2004. 2. At the subregional level, the SRAP is formulated, adopted, and implemented during 1999-2004. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Action plan documents and activity reports from the NRM Policy Program. 2. The PASR document and activity reports from the NRM Policy Program.
Information Program, AGRHYMET: Provide regular and pertinent information to policy-makers and other actors for more rational decision-making about food security, NRM, and the environment in the Sahel and coastal West Africa.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Beginning in 2000, all the decisions made in the areas of Food Security and NRM conform to the conclusions of the balance sheets for food production/security and the status of the natural resource base. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Activity reports from AGRHYMET's Information Program and information from the ministries and other institutions responsible for food security and NRM.
Training Program, AGRHYMET: Increase and reinforce the technical capacities of the national- and regional-level actors who work in the areas of food security and NRM through professional training adapted to the Sahelian context.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In 2001, at least 80% of the graduates of the Training Program hold positions that conform to their qualifications in institutions responsible for formulating and implementing Food Security and NRM policies in the CILSS States. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Records of former students of AGRHYMET's Training Program and surveys in the States.
Agro-Socio-Economic Research Program, INSAH: Promote strategic options to alleviate the agro-socio-economic constraints on sustainable development in the Sahel at the national and subregional levels.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In 2001, strategic options are available and adopted in the areas of: environmental education, intensive agriculture that preserves natural resources, and food security strategies. 2. In 2004, national development policies take into account all or some of the strategic options. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. INSAH's reports and validation sessions, and the Council of Ministers' resolutions. 2. The States' national policy documents.
Population and Development Research Program, INSAH: Formulate and propose options to alleviate the demographic constraints on the Sahel's sustainable development for the CILSS States and the subregional level.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A priority program of action and investment in the area of population and development, adapted to the recommendations of the Action Program of Ouagadougou, is implemented in 2004. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Program implementation reports from the CILSS States.

Table 4. Draft Evaluation Indicators for INSAH's Major Programs' Operational Objectives

Major Programs' Operational Objectives	Indicators in the 1999-2001 <i>Plan Triennial</i>		Revised and Additional Indicators	
	2001	2004	2001	2004
<p>AGROSOC: Promote strategic options to alleviate the agro-socio-economic constraints on sustainable development in the Sahel at the national and subregional levels.</p>	<p>In 2001, strategic options are available and adopted in the areas of: environmental education, intensive agriculture that preserves natural resources, and food security strategies.</p>	<p>In 2004, national development policies take into account all or some of the strategic options.</p>	<p>Revised <i>Plan</i> indicator: By 2001, the strategic options proposed by AGROSOC have been validated by all the CILSS States.</p>	<p>Revised <i>Plan</i> indicator: By 2004, at least 5 States' development policies and programs include AGROSOC's strategic options for environmental education, food security, and intensive agriculture that preserves natural resources.</p> <p>Additional indicator: By 2004, at least 3 States have implemented some of AGROSOC's strategic options for intensifying agriculture that preserves natural resources.</p>
<p>CERPOD: Formulate and propose options to alleviate the demographic constraints on the Sahel's sustainable development for the CILSS States and the subregional level.</p>	<p>No indicator.</p>	<p>A priority program of action and investment in the area of population and development, adapted to the recommendations of the Action Program of Ouagadougou, is implemented in 2004.</p>	<p>In 2001, at least 3 States use CERPOD's strategic options and demographic variables in their development strategies and programs.</p>	<p>In 2004, at least 6 States use CERPOD's strategic options and demographic variables in their development strategies and programs.</p>

Table 5. Draft Results-Level Evaluation Indicators for AGROSOC

Result	Indicators for 2001	Indicators for 2004	Data Sources	Data Collector
I. Improve the knowledge of the agro-socio-economic constraints on sustainable development in the Sahel and propose strategic options to alleviate them.	A synthesis report containing strategic options for sustainable land use, water control, improved organization of the regional seed network, and improving the links between agricultural growth and child nutrition (Mali-specific but a reference for the other CILSS countries), and environmental education is validated and available in 2001.	At least three donors and/or States use AGROSOC's strategic options in their policies or programs for sustainable development.	Partners' policy and program texts.	M&E Cell's consultant.
II. Develop and reinforce the CILSS States' and civil societies' institutional capacities.	<p>1. At least 3 NARS institutionalize AGROSOC's information and methods for evaluating the economic impact of agricultural research (the GAMS or economic excess methods) in their agricultural research programs.</p> <p>2. At least 3 NARS have operational teams trained in scientific and technical writing and publishing (operational = it is officially part of their work.)</p>	<p>1. At least 4 NARS use the economic evaluation of the impact of agricultural research methods in their proposals for funding for agricultural research.</p> <p>2. In 2004, the number of articles by NARS researchers published in international scientific journals is greater than in 1996.</p>	<p>1. States' agricultural research documents.</p> <p>2. Number of trainees and their time allocation.</p> <p>3. NARS' agricultural research proposals.</p> <p>4. NARS researchers' publications lists.</p>	M&E Cell's consultant.
III. Develop synergy among the NARSs for the generation and promotion of appropriate technology.	At least 3 States' Thematic Regional Programs are operational (operational = produce an annual report, and the Regional Coordination Committee holds an annual meeting attended by representatives from all the States.)	Each State's Thematic Regional Program has formulated and has available for use at least one appropriate technology.	The Regional Coordinating Committee's meetings and publications.	M&E Cell's consultant.

Table 5. Draft Results-Level Evaluation Indicators for AGROSOC, continued

Result	Indicators for 2001	Indicators for 2004	Data Sources	Data Collector
IV. Make available strategies and methodological tools for education and communication in order to make environmental education sustainable.	This EU-funded activity will end in December 2000. The EU has funded both internal and external evaluations that will be completed in late May 2000. A total of 3,853 people were interviewed in the internal evaluation, and the data are organized in eight national and one regional database.	At least 3 States have implemented their national continuation plans for environmental education (" <i>plan d'accompagnement</i> .")	State documents.	M&E Cell's consultant.
V. Validate and disseminate research results at the national and regional levels.	<p>1. AGROSOC's current research results are regularly updated and available on INSAH's Web site.</p> <p>2. AGROSOC publishes regularly: "<i>Sahel IPM</i>" three times/year, "<i>Liaison Sahel</i>" four times/year, and two monographs on food security or NRM.</p>	<p>1. The "<i>Revue des etudes et recherche Saheliennes</i>" is published regularly twice a year.</p> <p>2. The major research results from at least 4 of the NARS are available on the INSAH/AGROSOC Web site.</p>	AGROSOC publications and the INSAH/AGROSOC Web site.	M&E Cell's consultant.

Table 6. Draft Results-Level Evaluation Indicators for CERPOD

Result	Indicators for 2001	Indicators for 2004	Data Sources	Data Collector
I. The socio-demographic constraints on sustainable development are known and the research results are disseminated in the Sahel.	<p>1. In 2001, CERPOD's publications from 1995+ on the socio-demographic constraints on sustainable development are available in the documentation centers of at least 3 States and on the Web.</p> <p>2. In 2001, at least 3 States have used CERPOD's research results on socio-demographic constraints in formulating their development policies and programs.</p>	<p>1. In 2004, CERPOD's publications from 1995+ on the socio-demographic constraints on sustainable development are available in the documentation centers of at least 6 States and on the Web.</p> <p>2. In 2004, at least 6 States have used CERPOD's research results on socio-demographic constraints in formulating their development policies and programs.</p>	1.Documentation centers' bibliographies and Web sites.	M&E Cell's consultants.
II. The process of formulating, implementing, and monitoring/evaluating population and development policies and programs is supported and reinforced at the national and subregional levels, based on the options proposed.	<p>1. In 2001, at least 3 States have integrated CERPOD's options into the demographic policies or programs they have implemented.</p> <p>2. In 2002, all the States participate in a regional meeting to discuss a population program that includes CERPOD's options.</p>	In 2004, at least 6 States have integrated CERPOD's options into the demographic policies or programs they have implemented.	States' policy and program texts.	M&E Cell's consultants.
III. National and Sahelian competence in the area of population and sustainable development are improved.	In 2001, the national demographic institutions in at least 3 States are the principal sources of demographic information for the States and CILSS's partners.	<p>1. In 2004, the national demographic institutions in at least 6 States are the principal sources of demographic information for the States and CILSS's partners.</p> <p>2. In 2004, the national demographic institutions in at least 6 States are the regional references (standards) for demographic information.</p>	States' and partners' key documents.	M&E Cell's consultants.

Table 7. Proposed Monitoring System for CILSS

Level	Information Producer	Monthly	Quarterly*	Information Producer	Bi-annual	Annual
Sub-Activity	Head of Activity	X	X			
Activity	Head of Activity	X	X	M&E Cell, CP		X
Result (Operational Unit)	Head of Operational Unit	X	X	CP and Head of Program		X
Major Program	Head of Major Program	X	X	CP and Head of Program		X
Center	DG			CP and DG	X	X
New Activities and Programs	DG, MP			CP, SE, and DG		X
Conventions and Agreements	DG			CP, SE, and DG		X
Information Users		Heads of: Activities, OUs, Major Programs, and the DGs	Heads of: Activities, OUs, Major Programs, the DGs, and USAID		CP, SE, DG, MP, M&E Cell	**Partners, CTG, Council of Ministers, SE, CD, CP, Centers, Major Programs, and Operational Units

* The second quarterly report will supply information for the Major Programs' retreats to prepare for the CTGs.

** Partners = States, donors, and civil society (NGOs, associations, platforms).

Table 8. Proposed Evaluation System for CILSS

CILSS Level	Major Program Level	Information Producer	Three-Year Evaluation: Performance*	Six-Year Evaluation: Impact**	Ten-Year Evaluation: Impact	Status of Evaluation Indicators	Information Users
Operational Objective (one)	Strategic Objective (one)	Major Programs, Centers, the M&E Cell	X	X	X	3 in the <i>Plan Triennial</i>	Partners, Council of Ministers, SE, CD, CP, CTG, Centers, Major Programs, Operational Units, civil society
Intermediate Results (6)	Operational Objectives (6)	Major Programs, Centers, the M&E Cell	X	X	X	11 in the <i>Plan Triennial</i> ; in draft form for AGRHYMET (Adelski 1998)	Partners, Council of Ministers, SE, CD, CP, CTG, Centers, Major Programs, Operational Units, civil society
Principal Activities (21)	Results, or Operational Units (21)	Operational Units, Major Programs, Centers, the M&E Cell	X	X	X	None in the <i>Plan Triennial</i> ; in draft form for INSAH and the Policy Programs (Adelski 1999 and 2000)	Partners, Council of Ministers, SE, CD, CP, CTG, Centers, Major Programs, Operational Units, civil society

* Performance: progress, efficiency. ** Impact: change, effects.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adelski, E., 1998, "Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators for AGRHYMET's Strategic Plan, 1999-2001," ARD/USAID, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

Adelski, E., September 1999, "Proposed Activity-Level Impact Indicators for the Institute of the Sahel's Agro-Socio-Economic Research Program," The Mitchell Group/USAID, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

Adelski, E., October 1999, "Strategies and Monitoring Indicators to Improve Gender Equity in CILSS's Policy Programs for Food Security and Natural Resource Management in 2000," The Mitchell Group/USAID, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

Cherif, C., January 2000, Annex 1, "Report on the First Phase," CILSS, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso.

Cherif, C., January 2000, Annex 2, "Monitoring and Evaluation Manual for CILSS (Project)," CILSS, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso.

Cherif, C., February 2000, Annex 3, "Monitoring and Evaluation, Complementary Aspects," CILSS, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso.

Cherif, C., March 2000, "Consultancy in Monitoring and Evaluation (first phase), Note on the Final Report of the First Phase of Implementing the M&E System," CILSS, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso.

CILSS, Executive Secretary, January 1999, "*Plan Triennal 1999-2001, (Version finale)*," CILSS, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso.

Major Program for Research on Population and Development (CERPOD), no date, "*Synthese du Plan Triennal 2000-2002*," INSAH, Bamako, Mali.

Organisation de Cooperation et de Developpement Economiques, March 1999, "*Evaluation Externe des Programmes Majeurs Politiques du CILSS, Rapport Final*," Paris, France.

OSS (Observatory of the Sahara and the Sahel), UNESCO, CILSS, 1999, "The Impact Indicators of the Anti-Desertification Convention," Paris, France.

USAID, Regional Strategy Team, Africa Bureau, March 2000, "Strategic Plan FY 2001-2008 for the West African Regional Program (WARP)," Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

PEOPLE CONTACTED

Moussa Batchily Ba	AGROSOC
Chako Cherif	CILSS M&E Consultant
Blamsia Braoussala	Planning Councilor, SE/CILSS
Moussa Dolo	CERPOD
Alfaroukh Idriss	Director General of INSAH
Bakary Kante	AGROSOC
Dabo Keffing	CERPOD
Samba Ly	AGROSOC
Yade Mbaye	AGROSOC
Laomiabao Netoyo	AGROSOC
Jorge Oliveira	Development Liaison Officer, The Mitchell Group/INSAH
Mariam Sow	AGROSOC
Wilbur Thomas	Senior Development Liaison Officer, The Mitchell Group/CILSS
Baba Traore	Director of CERPOD
Gaoussou Traore	Director of AGROSOC
Sadio Traore	CERPOD

TERMS of REFERENCE